DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 098 SO 010 923

TITLE The Creative Woman: A Report of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities.
INSTITUTION National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 58p.; Tables and lists on pages 7, 13, 31, 33 and all footnotes may not reproduce clearly in hard copy due to small type size of original document
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 040-000-00368-1, $0.90, paper cover)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; Architecture; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Feminism; *Fine Arts; Foundation Programs; Government Role; Higher Education; *Humanities; Librarians; Museums; Music; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Theater Arts; Working Women

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents a report on the status of women in the arts and humanities. The report points out the inequities and sex discrimination widespread in the field. Inequities occur in salary, opportunity of employment, and advancement to higher positions. The study was prepared by a Committee on the Arts and Humanities designated by the National Commission for the Observance of International Women's Year. Information was gathered from four major sources: (1) testimony in seven hearings before the Commission; (2) women working in the arts and humanities; (3) selected survey of private foundations; and (4) selective public members with specific and general knowledge of the field. Information in the report addresses itself to the creative and performing arts, architecture, cultural institutions such as libraries and museums, private foundations, teachers of the arts and humanities, and the government. The Committee recommended that women be appointed to managerial, administrative, and policymaking posts in cultural institutions; grant-awarding panels be more equitably comprised of men and women; blind judging be instituted for all candidates for art and humanities awards, fellowships, exhibitions, and employment; and radio and television industries correct the pervasive under-representation of women in prime-time roles and commercials. An appendix lists members of the Arts and Humanities Committee, guest panelists at the Committee Hearings, and recommendations of the Committee. A bibliography is included. (JR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155098

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Creative Woman

A Report of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WEECN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975

SP 010 923

"There is no better way to view the quality of a civilization than by the richness and vitality of its art. The music, drama, comedy and films reflect the spirit of its people—their ability to create and appreciate—to laugh, to love, and to learn."

President GERALD R. FORD

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
I. The Creative and Performing Arts	
The Creative Arts	3
The Performing Arts: Stage, Film, TV, and Radio	6
Music	10
Architecture, City Planning	14
II. Our Cultural Institutions	
Libraries	17
Museums	20
III. Private Foundations	23
IV. Teaching the Arts and Humanities	24
V. Government and the Arts and Humanities	29
National Endowment for the Arts	30
National Endowment for the Humanities	31
Government Policies and the Arts	34
Government Support for the Arts and Humanities	36
Appendixes	
1. Members of the Arts and Humanities Committee	39
2. Guest Panelists at Committee Hearings	41
3. Recommendations of the Committee	42
4. Bibliographical Notes	51

INTRODUCTION

No other presidentially appointed commission on women, before this one, has looked into the status of women in the arts and humanities.

Yet, today, nearly 300,000 American women are molding sculptures, writing poetry and history, painting canvases, teaching languages, music, drama and art, singing, dancing, acting—in short, *working for a living* in the arts and humanities. Far from dilettantes, they are as concerned as any working women with equal pay, equal recognition, equal time.

The explosive rise in public awareness and support of the arts in recent years, the surging attendance at dance, music and theater performances, at museums and libraries, and, very particularly, the introduction of Federal funding of the arts and humanities, which began in 1965, has sharpened their concern.

These factors urged the National Commission for the Observance of International Women's Year to add a new dimension to its inquiries, by designating a Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

The Committee realized from the start that, with limited time and funds, it could try to do no more than identify a few of the major issues affecting women in this immense and varied field. It adopted four lines of inquiry.

Its principal source of information has been testimony in seven hearings before the Committee—testimony from creative and performing artists, from teachers of the arts, from members of the unions covering performing artists, such as Actors' Equity and Screen Actors' Guild, and related theater crafts people, and from the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities as the principal agencies for Federal funding.

The second major source was the women themselves who work in the arts and humanities—women from stage and screen, women in public radio and TV, women in libraries, in college teaching of art, music, languages, women in architecture and city planning. In the 6 years since the women's movement first caught fire in 1969–1970, women's "caucuses," "conferences," or "task forces" were formed in virtually every one of these major professions to survey the special problems of women in employment, earnings, and status. In a spirit

of lively interest and cooperation with the Committee and its objectives, these groups have given it access to their published reports, surveys, articles—some of them so recent as to arrive even in the form of manuscript or proofs, and most of them of a highly professional character.

Further, the Committee initiated a selective survey of the role of private foundations which award grants in the arts and humanities, and an exploratory survey on museum hiring and grant making practices affecting women. These surveys were undertaken by Vandegriff Research, of Bethesda, Maryland.

As a continuing resource, the Committee has had the help of selected public members with both special and general knowledge of several fields. Additionally, the Committee's staff has sought out as much recent data as possible from government and private sources.

But time was all too brief for this Committee to profess to have even touched every branch of its many-sided subject. It was not, for example, able to touch at all on the fields of dance (where women make up 82% of the profession), or film and photography, or creative writing.

In short, the chief virtue of this study, as presented here, is not its depth or comprehensiveness. Rather it is its attempt to bring together, for the first time, a reasonably broad perspective on the hitherto unexplored field—the status of women in the arts and humanities, and to present the Committee's proposals for correcting the discrimination and inequities it has unquestionably found. The Committee at the same time hopes it may have opened the door for broader inquiries by others.

This report was released in April 1976.

I. The Creative and Performing Arts

THE CREATIVE ARTS

"A woman artist must work twice as hard to get half as much credit as a male artist." This remark, attributed to a women curator of a leading New York museum, in effect summarizes the findings of the Committee as it held a hearing for some representative women artists, and talked with individual artists and members of the many women artists' groups now active.

Clearly, the women's movement by 1969–70 had struck an instantly responsive chord among women creative artists. Many had struggled for years under sharp and unmistakable discrimination by galleries, by museums, and by art critics and journals. As late as 1972, *Time* [1] magazine reported that "In Manhattan, the leading art marketplace, the 100 principal modern art galleries represent about 1,000 artists. Of these, 20% are women . . . The Metropolitan Museum collection of contemporary art includes 10% by women. At the Museum of Modern Art women provide 9% of the collection; at Washington's Corcoran Gallery 6% . . . In its 43-year history, the Museum of Modern Art has mounted 1,000 one-artist exhibitions. Only 5 were by women . . . Of 52 such shows at the Los Angeles County Museum none has been a woman." *Time* went on to quote Thomas Hoving, Director of New York's Metropolitan Museum as saying, "Women artists have been given a rough time. The crime has not been discrimination but a lack of perception."

Interestingly enough, a study published in *Visual Dialog*, February 1976, shows that over the 12-year period, 1960–72, women did considerably better in juried shows, where the names of the artists were concealed, than they did in one-artist or group invitational shows where name and hence sex are known.

A survey conducted over 1970–71 by the Tarmarind Lithography Workshop (whose founder, June Wayne, a distinguished printmaker, was a participant at the Committee's October 1975 hearing) documents how men dominate the art world at other crucial points.

[1] *Time*, Mar. 20, 1972.

For example, art critics in major art journals and leading newspapers are predominantly men (except on *Crafts Horizons*[2]). Male artists received the majority (72%–95%) of the space in art reviews, and had illustrations of their works reproduced in such reviews 8 to 12 times more often than women. Lila Katzen, sculptor, another participant in the October hearing, pointed out how many of the basic college texts on the history of art either minimize or omit entirely the contribution of women artists.

The Committee learned that women artists, faced with such difficulties, began in 1969–70 to take sharp action on several fronts. On the one hand, they directly protested to the major museums which discriminate. For example, a women's ad hoc committee of artists, aroused by the extraordinarily low proportion of women artists—5% in 1969—chosen for exhibits for the Whitney Museum's well-known Annual Show, staged bitter protests. Fortunately, two curators who were active feminists had already been appointed and the Whitney has included many women in various shows since that time. Similar protests have been mounted against museums in Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston, and elsewhere. Women's artists' groups also met with museum directors and curatorial staff to focus attention on the issue, with occasional success.

Another form of action has been to organize special exhibitions of women's work in many cities. Diane Burko, a Philadelphia painter and also a panelist at the Committee's October hearing, described how she with other women artists organized a citywide exhibit "Philadelphia Focuses on Women in the Visual Arts," in which every major cultural institution in the city eventually participated.

In a further kind of protest, women artists faced with persistent, documented discrimination by major galleries responded by establishing their own galleries outside the established gallery structure. Many such galleries now exist, some as cooperatives. While there now is said to be noticeable improvement among established galleries in showing women's work, knowledgeable sources confessed to the Committee that it is still hard for women to get shown in such galleries which, though "better," are still "not completely fair."

Women artists have also established their own art journals and newsletters where women art critics and art historians serve as edi-

---

[2] It should be said here that in crafts generally there appears to be less discrimination. The same seems to be true in photography. The Committee was informed that it is much easier for women photographers, some of whom have distinguished reputations in the art world, to obtain gallery and exhibit space. The Museum of Modern Art, for example, reports several one-artist shows by women photographers.

tors or contributors.[3] Women's art information centers have been founded in Washington, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. Women art historians have also been preparing special texts and teaching materials on women artists.

Testimony was presented at the October hearing that for most women artists annual earnings are low, and women's art on the whole has not sold for as high prices as that of men. (This has accounted in part for the prejudice of galleries to showing women artists.) U.S. Census data for 1970 amply document the low earnings—half of all women painters and sculptors earned less than $3,946 a year.[4] Many women artists as well as their male colleagues are thus forced to teach. "The campuses are our only support," we were told.

Yet on campus the widespread, entrenched academic prejudice against women, documented elsewhere in this report (see Chapter IV), and the resulting inequities in salaries and status again discriminate against the woman artist-as-teacher. College and university teachers of art (and drama and music) record half the earnings of their male colleagues. A 1973 survey conducted by the Women's Caucus of the College Art Association—reported to the Committee by the Caucus's president, art historian Dr. Mary Garrard of American University—showed that although women have more (25% more) advanced degrees than their male colleagues, they are chiefly held to the lower ranks of instructor and assistant professor. In studio programs, however, less emphasis is placed on degrees than on a record of exhibits or other signs of visible success as an artist. Exhibitions are the art world's equivalent of the "publish or perish" syndrome in the universities. Thus, women artists are obviously caught in a vicious circle—the prejudice of galleries against exhibiting women's work makes it difficult for women studio teachers to accumulate an exhibition record.

The very active role women artists have taken to break down prejudice has had some, if limited, results. One minor but important improvement has been the wider use by critics of the terms "one-artist" show, or "solo exhibition" instead of the long prevalent "one-man" show. Other evidence [5] has been the greater openness by editors of some of the art journals to include reviews of women artists. "Certainly consciousness about women artists has been raised," the Committee was told, "but not *changed*. That's the next step."

While the Committee could not directly act to ease the plight of women artists, several of its recommendations passed by the full

[3] Much of the information cited here on the women's art movement is drawn from an article by the art critic Cindy Nemser, editor of the *Feminist Art Journal*, writing in *Journal's* winter issue, 1973–74.

[4] 1969 data. See chart, p. 7, footnote 2.

[5] Judy Loeb, "Our Women Artist/Teachers Need Our Help," *Art Education*, Nov. 1975.

Commission may, it is hoped, have a salutory effect. These include the Commission's Recommendations I and II urging that all local cultural institutions, including museums, put more women in managerial positions, on policy-making boards, and on grant-making panels. The Committee also urges that State and local women's groups monitor cultural institutions to be sure they do so. Further, the Commission has also approved Committee Recommendation III, that urges agencies which award grants and select artists for exhibition to judge applicants in "blind" review, i.e., without identification by sex. Other Committee recommendations concern increased government support for the arts and revision of prejudicial tax policies (see Appendix 3, Recommendations of the Committee).

THE PERFORMING ARTS: STAGE, FILM, TV, AND RADIO

Here the Committee could at best take only a very small sampling of testimony, chiefly through a hearing for performing artists —members of Actors' Equity, the Screen Actors' Guild, the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA). The Committee, also, as in other fields, collected many surveys already prepared either by these or other agencies, and talked with knowledgeable sources. Again the evidence, except for the stage,[6] clearly documents a pattern of discrimination. Discrimination is marked in acting roles for women in public and commercial television, in public radio, in television commercials, and in managerial positions for women in public TV and radio.

While it received no testimony of discrimination on stage, the Committee was startled to learn, from an analysis made by Actors' Equity of stage parts in major Broadway and off-Broadway productions from 1953 to 1972, that for those 20 years only a third of the available parts in some 350 plays were roles for women.

The Committee also received evidence that when women tried to move from acting into stage production or direction, they have encountered resistance, as do even trained and successful women directors.[7]

---

[6] The Committee did not cover dance. Roughly 82% of all dancers are women.

[7] A 6-year survey of 50 nonprofit theaters across the country, prepared in late 1975 by an informal New York group, Action for Women in Theatre, suggests that both women playwrights and directors have rough sledding everywhere. Out of the hundreds of plays produced by these theaters in the 6 years studied only 7% were by women playwrights, and only 6% were directed by women. Eleven of the 50 theaters produced no plays written by women, and over half—26—hired no women directors.

DISCRIMINATION: THE RECORD IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

(Adapted from the U.S. Census, 1970)[1]

Profession	MEN				WOMEN				
	Men	Median earnings (dollars)[2]	Median weeks worked[3]	Median school years completed	Women		Median earnings (dollars)[2]	Median weeks worked[3]	Median school years completed
	Total				Total	Percent			
Architects	54,948	13,188	50+	17.0	2,133	3.7	8,995	50+	17.0
Actors	8,213	6,816	37.9	14.5	5,927	41.9	5,021	28.5	13.8
Authors	18,069	10,823	50+	15.9	7,935	30.5	5,451	50+	16.2
Dancers	1,271	4,421	42.7	12.9	5,653	81.6	3,469	36.9	12.3
Designers	85,243	11,155	50+	14.1	27,082	24.1	5,461	50+	13.7
Musicians & composers	63,677	4,668	45.0	12.9	32,860	34.0	1,395	44.2	13.6
Painters & sculptors	67,917	9,454	50+	13.7	39,559	36.8	3,946	49.2	13.9
Photographers	56,526	8,551	50+	12.7	9,434	14.3	3,655	50+	12.6
Radio & television announcers	20,873	6,974	50+	13.8	1,423	6.4	2,963	50+	13.4
Librarians	22,819	7,727	50+	17+	100,325	81.5	6,203	47.5	16.6
Archivists & curators	4,843	7,537	50+	15.8	2,167	30.9	5,691	50+	16.0
Urban & regional planners	8,251	11,544	50+	17.0	963	10.5	6,726	50+	16.9
Lawyers	252,097	18,749	50+	17+	12,655	4.8	8,980	50+	17+
Teachers, college and university									
Art, drama & music	19,992	10,735	48.6	17+	10,662	34.8	5,242	42.0	17+
English	22,928	10,499	48.3	17+	16,484	41.8	6,860	42.5	17+
Foreign language	11,310	10,237	48.7	17+	9,946	46.8	5,824	41.4	17+
Law	2,808	18,161	50+	17+	197	6.6	....	....	....
History	14,032	10,833	49.6	17+	3,060	17.9	6,304	42.9	17+
Theology	4,308	9,603	50+	17+	881	17.0	3,682	42.1	17+
Total	740,120				289,306	28.1			

[1] *Occupational Characteristics*, 1970 Census of Population. PC(2)-7A, pp. 1-2. Subject Reports, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[2] 1969 data—includes earnings from wages/salaries/self-employment income from all sources, some of which might have been outside the stated profession.

[3] Includes all time worked, whether or not in the stated profession.

Note.—"Median" is not an average; rather it indicates the mid-point—there are as many below a median as above it.

Acting is a precarious profession at best, and the fabled salaries earned by a few stars tend to obscure the fact that half of all actresses worked less than 28½ weeks and earned less than $5,021 a year (1970 U.S. Census).[8] (The profession is hard for men too, although half of them worked longer and earned roughly $1,800 more each year.)

With the legitimate theater providing such uncertain employment, it is not surprising that work in television provides a substantial part of actors' earnings. Discrimination against women in TV, therefore, imposes a particularly serious hardship. It takes two forms: the scarcity of dramatic roles for women, and the preference for men on TV commercials. A 1974 study by the Women's Conference Committee of the Screen Actors' Guild found that on all three major commercial network stations over a typical month in Los Angeles 71.5% of all dramatic roles were male; 28.5% female—an even lower proportion than on the stage. (There are informal data that men and women are used in more equal proportion on daytime serials, and some indications in partial studies that by 1975 women had begun faring slightly better.)

Another 1974 Screen Actors' Guild study also found that in TV commercials, men outnumbered women two to one in the total use as performers; in the especially well-paid roles of off-camera "speaking principals"—men had 93% of all such parts. This was true even when the product advertised was a "women's product"—such as household cleaners, foods, and cosmetics. The scene is all too familiar: two hapless housewives in the laundry room confused as to which soap powder gets out the most dirt, then a strong "voice of authority"—*male*—asserting that the best is brand x. Other studies[9] show that men dominate as speaking principals in children's commercials as well.

Public radio and television are no better. A thoroughly documented report issued in October 1975 by a special Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting of the Corporation of Public Broadcasting (CPB) found "pervasive under-representation" of women in public radio and TV.

Key statements from this report should be quoted here:

> "In 28 adult TV programs, 18 hours, there were 200 males and only 36 females (85%/15%). Of the 28 programs, 11 had *no* women participants . . . In adult radio programs women fared slightly better, with 428 men and 127 women (77%/23%) . . . Women's programming is clearly lacking in both radio and television . . . Overall, in the average of all children's programs the number of male characters exceeded that of female two to one . . . 90% of the announcers promoting programs over PBS (the Public Broadcasting Service) and 73% of those pro-

[8] 1969 data. See Chart, p. 7, footnote 2.

[9] Cited in the Female Image in Children's TV Commercials, by Mary Ellen Verna, *Journal of Broadcasting*, vol. 19:3 (Summer 1975).

moting programs over NPR (National Public Radio) were male."

No fully comparable study has been done of commercial radio and TV.[10] The few available indicators include the already cited Screen Actors' Guild study showing that on the average 71.5% of the prime-time dramatic roles were male, and a U.S. 1970 Census report that less than 7% of radio and TV announcers were women. Perhaps one of the most revealing indicators for both TV and radio is the most recent (May 1974) figure of total membership in the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists. Men outnumber women members two to one; among actor and dancer members, about three to one. It appears that the "under-representation" of women may well be as "pervasive" in commercial broadcasting as in public radio and TV.

The CPB Task Force report also reveals that women in public TV are admitted only in a minor way to managerial positions (see table). Although they fare distinctly better in public radio management, they are virtually excluded from management in public combined TV-radio station facilities. Salary levels reflect clear discrimination—men tend "to be hired at more responsible jobs at higher salaries than women of equal education and experience."

Percentage of Women Employed in Managerial Positions in Public TV and Radio Broadcasting, 1974 [1]

Position	*Television*	*Radio*	*Joint facility*
General manager	3	4	0
Station manager	2	12	8
Operations manager	7	19	10
Program manager	13	17	0
Production manager	5	5	0
Business manager	45	82	24
Chief engineer	0	0	0

[1] *Report on Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting*, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Caroline Isber and Muriel Canton, coauthors, Oct. 5, 1975, p. 38.

The Committee notes with interest and satisfaction three recent high-level appointments for women in both commercial and public

[10] Two valuable sources of information on full-time staff employment in the broadcasting industry are: (1) *Employment in the Broadcasting Industry*, 1975, Research Branch, Broadcast Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; and (2) *Television Station Employment Practices*, 1975, Office of Communications, United Churches of Christ, New York. Both studies report small but appreciable increases in women's employment in administrative and professional positions.

TV. In December 1975, NBC appointed a woman vice president for daytime programming (the highest rank achieved in the TV commercial networks up to that time by any woman); in early February 1976 ABC appointed a woman vice president to head its documentary unit. In the same month, President Ford nominated a woman to the CPB board; if confirmed she will bring the total number of women on the CPB board to four, out of a total of 15 members.

The Committee has addressed two recommendations to the problem of discriminatory practices in radio and TV—the most influential media of our time. The first, Recommendation IV, adopted by the full Commission, recommends to the President that the Office of Management and Budget and Congress ask for a statement from CPB on remedial steps taken and improvements actually achieved when CPB next submits its request for its appropriations; and recommends that CPB do a follow-up study on women in 5 years. The IWY Commission passed a companion recommendation from the Committee (Recommendation V) on commercial broadcasting, recommending that the President urge the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to identify and attack discriminatory practices by commercial stations.

It should be noted here that the Arts and Humanities Committee deliberately did not address itself to the question of the image of women projected by public and commercial TV and radio. By mutual agreement, this extremely important issue was considered by the Commission's Committee on the Media.

MUSIC

In its inquiry into the status of women in the music world, the Committee was particularly fortunate to have had, in addition to a hearing with the noted conductor Antonia Brico, the cooperation of the American Symphony Orchestra League which prepared, at the Committee's express request, the first survey ever made of the status of women as instrumentalists, conductors, and managers in the nation's symphony orchestras.

Maestra Brico appeared before the Committee in late August 1975, on the eve of her first appearance with the National Symphony Orchestra since 1941. Accompanying her was Joyce Bartholson, one of whose compositions Brico conducted the next day. "Conducting is the last stronghold to fall before male prejudice," Brico reported. By 1975, possibly in part as a result of pressures from women's groups and general "consciousness-raising," women conductors were indeed getting a greater chance to be seen and heard. The American Symphony Orchestra League in its survey lists some of them:

"Eve Queler, now conductor of the New York Opera Orchestra, was music director of the Fort Wayne Philharmonic in the 1960's. Beatrice Brown is conductor of the Ridgefield (Connecticut) Symphony, Frances Steiner is conductor of the Compton (California) Symphony, and Margery Henke is conductor of the Tuscarawas County (Ohio) Philharmonic, and Jane Stewart is the conductor of the Juneau (Alaska) Symphony Orchestra. Margaret Hillis is conductor of the Chicago Symphony Chorus and music director of the Elgin (Illinois) Symphony Orchestra. Other women conductors active on the American orchestral scene are Joyce Johnson, Judith Somogi, Sonja Dalgren, Eleanor Weinberger, Maria Tunicka, Helen Quach, Victoria Bond, and Carolyn Hills, music director of the Livingston (New Jersey) Symphony. Sarah Caldwell, who has had tremendous success as artistic director of the Boston Opera Company, has only just begun to accept conducting engagements with major American orchestras (such as) the New York Philharmonic, the National Symphony and the Milwaukee Symphony during the 1975–76 season."

The Committee did not receive testimony on the status of women singers. Rather, from Brico and others it learned that all American singers, male and female, suffer privation and discrimination. Unlike Europe, the United States does not have local opera houses in almost every city, and offers few other opportunities for young singers. Brico told us that in Denver, her home city, "there is only one permanent paid position for a singer—in a mortuary." She urged a look at national priorities—whether there were too many funds going into teaching more singers and too little into providing opportunities for them to *perform*. "It is pitiful, a heart-break, a tragedy," she said, "to see the tremendous number of young singers being turned out of conservatories when there are absolutely no outlets for them."

The Greek Muse of music is always depicted as an instrumentalist, carrying a lyre. But it is only now, several millennia later, that her female descendants have been able to begin to take their due place.

Certainly, women instrumentalists except for an occasional romantic lady at the harp, have had a long wait for admission to major symphony orchestras. The first professional orchestra to accept a woman was the London Queen's Hall Orchestra in 1913; in 1923, when the Cleveland Orchestra hired four women, there was startled comment.

But matters have markedly improved since then, as the American Symphony Orchestra League's study shows in its survey covering the last 10 years.

The survey reports that in the major orchestras (those with a budget over $1 million), women represent an average of one-fourth (24.9%) of the total players in the 1974–75 season, as compared with 18.3% 10 years before, an astonishing gain of 36%.

Seven of the 27 "majors" surveyed, however, are progressing only slowly toward acceptance of women players, although even these too changed somewhat in the last decade. One major orchestra, for example, which had no women in 1964–65, 10 years later had six. No major orchestra in the 1974–75 season had fewer than six women instrumentalists; seven had 30 women or more; the average was 22.

The League's survey comments that, moreover, "Today, more than 60 women in the major symphonies are principals or coprincipals. Most women section heads play strings, flute, harp, or keyboard instruments, with a few exceptions: Sarah Watkins, principal oboist of the National Symphony Orchestra; Elaine Douvas, principal oboist with Atlanta; Susan Slaughter, principal trumpet with the Saint Louis Symphony."

What are called "metropolitan" orchestras (budgets over $100,000) have been consistently more open to women, according to the League's study. In 1964–65 women players constituted 36.5% of such orchestras, and the proportion went up to 40.6% over the next 10 years.

Urban and community orchestras (budgets over and under $50,000 respectively) have been more hospitable to women instrumentalists. In the three seasons of 1973 through 1975, 42.4% of their players have been women. The Symphony League survey also shows that "in metropolitan orchestras, the number of women principals increases, and there are a number of women concertmasters. A sampling of thirty-two urban and community orchestras, randomly selected, shows that there are thirteen women concertmasters, four assistant concertmasters, and fifty-nine section heads."

But the opportunities to play, important as they are, don't always add up to money. The Symphony Orchestra League makes these points:

> "Orchestras in small communities usually play a limited number of concerts and draw their players from local areas. Rehearsals are held in the evenings or on weekends, and musicians are either not paid or paid on a 'per-service' basis. As the size of a community grows larger, the number of concerts tends to increase and the budgets increase with them. Only in the largest metropolitan orchestras and the major orchestras is it possible to earn an adequate salary over the course of the year from playing in a symphony orchestra. (Eleven U.S. orchestras now pay all of their musicians on a 52-week basis.) Usually, orchestra salaries must be combined with teaching or other professional responsibilities, or be considered part-time work.
>
> "Orchestras with the highest budgets, longest seasons, and most generous salaries tend to have the fewest women musicians. Whether this is a natural reflection of the kinds of work being sought by women, or a factor of the women's movements not yet having influenced long-standing employment patterns, can-

not be determined without further study. A suit charging discrimination in promotion and pay practices, brought by a woman player in the Saint Louis Symphony Orchestra, was recently decided in favor of the Symphony."

The League's survey does include more positive notes:

"Fully one-third of all major orchestras now do preliminary auditions behind a screen, and two orchestras use a screen in the final auditions. More and more of the major orchestras are incorporating this practice into their audition procedures."

It should be added that in some orchestras, the selection of new instrumentalists is in the hands of the members of the orchestra, not the conductor, under union contract terms worked out for each orchestra.

Who runs the nation's orchestras? Or more pertinently, do women have any say in their management? Here the Symphony League's study reports some excellent news:

Percentage of Women Serving as Managers of Orchestras[1]

Season	*Major orchestras*	*Metropolitan orchestras*	*Urban/ Community orchestras*
1964–65	4.0	11.8	27.3
1965–66	4.0	15.2	25.0
1966–67	3.8	24.3	30.8
1967–68	0.0	20.2	31.4
1968–69	0.0	17.8	47.5
1969–70	3.6	18.6	35.5
1970–71	7.1	20.3	44.0
1971–72	7.1	24.7	52.0
1972–73	7.1	33.3	47.4
1973–74	3.6	28.6	54.2
% Change 1964–74	No Change	+154%	+100%

[1] *Women in American Symphony Orchestras*, American Symphony Orchestra League, Feb. 1976.

"The percentage of women orchestra managers has risen spectacularly in the last ten years except in the major orchestra category. During the ten-year period from 1964 to 1974 the number of women managers of metropolitan orchestras never fell below 11 percent of the total and was as high as 33 percent. In the urban/community category, the range was from 25 percent to 54 percent. During two recent seasons (1971–72 and 1973–74), more than half of the urban and community orchestra managers were women. At the end of the ten-year period, the number of women managers of metropolitan orchestras had increased 154 percent;

a 100 percent increase has occurred in the urban/community orchestra category."

The League study also tells us that although few (indeed only two) women manage the majors today, there were some distinguished pioneers, beginning with Mrs. Anna Millar, who ran the Chicago Symphony (1891–97). Notable women founded the symphonies in San Francisco (1909) and Cleveland (1918) and ran them for many years. Other pioneers managed major orchestras in Kansas City, Denver, Seattle, and the New York Philharmonic.

ARCHITECTURE, CITY PLANNING

Some 2,130 women told the 1970 U.S. Census that they are architects and some 960 said they were city planners. They represent but a small fraction of these professions—3.7% [11] of all architects, 10.5% of all planners. But as a total of 3,096 women engaged in an aspect of the creative arts perhaps more strongly dominated by men than any other, as well as one which deals most closely with the human environment, they were of interest to the Committee.

The major data on the status of women in architecture comes from a very frank and carefully detailed 1975 study by a Task Force on Women in Architecture prepared with the express support and blessing of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), which, itself preponderantly male, had at last recognized the need to take action "to integrate women as full participants in the profession."

The Task Force's study documents a now familiar story:—men's salaries on the average 61% higher than women's (with the equally familiar salary gap when first hired—a gap which grows wider with the years), lack of the internship opportunities regularly afforded men, advancement which "usually stops at the lower middle echelons —even if actual work performed is similar to that performed by men with higher titles and salaries."

And the Task Force notes stereotyping of a special kind, such as: belief that women are "more capable of designing residences, kitchens," reluctance to send a woman architect to a building site "on the assumption that prejudical attitudes of contractors and construction workers would prevent her from doing her job—the study did not uncover evidence supporting this assumption"; and sexist wording in publications, manuals, etc., which "encourage perpetuation of sexual stereotyping."

Mincing no words, the study concluded that inequities and stereotypes, based on "traditional and outmoded views of the role of

[11] A considerably smaller proportion (1.25%) are *registered* women architects, i.e., they have a license to practice on their own.

women in society" have "translated themselves into widespread patterns and systems which often unintentionally, but nevertheless systematically, discriminate against women."

Such "systematic discrimination" may have in earlier years deterred women from making architecture a career. Things may be changing. Figures for 1975–76 show a marked increase generally from 1972–73 undergraduate enrollment of women in architecture—up from 7.8% to 14.3% in that period, with a substantial increase in certain schools. Yet the AIA study reports that "no known recruitment attempt has been made to increase the numbers of women students," and frankly admits that "recruitment of women faculty has resulted primarily from the pressure of Federal legislation related to funding."

After completing its study, the Task Force on Women in Architecture drew up for the AIA an affirmative action plan, which, the head of the Task Force believes, will have repercussions throughout the profession. The plan provides goals for representation of women in the profession, for equal opportunities, for integration of women into the Institute itself. The plan was unanimously adopted at the AIA's December 1975 board meeting, and copies of the plan and survey have been sent for consideration by all regional AIA meetings in the United States. The Institute in its 1976 budget has laid out a 4-year timetable to achieve the plan's objectives, and at each yearend will present a progress report of accomplishment. To cite an AIA spokesman, "We're on our way—now we'll have to deliver."

City planning perhaps belongs more properly to the social sciences than the humanities, but the Committee treats it here as a field with close ties to architecture. Moreover, planning is becoming a field in which more and more women are getting degrees (22.3% of all planning degrees were earned by women in 1974 compared to 7.8% in 1968), and with the growing recognition that women have a special contribution to make in urban planning.

A Women's Rights Committee of the American Institute of Planners (AIP) was set up in 1971 and formed a joint committee with women from the American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) in 1973. Membership surveys undertaken by these women's committees found widespread discrimination in hiring, utilization, earnings, and education of women planners and each presented its findings to its parent board. One of the major recommendations was that women should constitute a minimum of 20% in every planning organization and 20% of managerial and supervisory positions.

Some highlights of the ASPO survey: "The general pattern is for the percentage of women at each level (of a planning organization) to decrease as one moves up the hierarchy . . . for the distribution of women (to be) heavily skewed in the direction of the lower

levels. Out of 559 planning agencies reporting, 68% had *no* women in professional planning positions on their staffs. Only 6 agencies—all of them small—had women directors."

In the spring of 1975 the joint AIP/ASPO Women's Rights Committee conducted a follow-up survey to see what if any improvement had been made as a result of presentation of its findings and recommendations to the parent boards. The survey's preliminary findings, now available, appear to be distinctly encouraging. Of 27 State (or regional) chapters responding to the survey's query on the proportion of women in all professional planning positions, 11 had pushed up their presentation of women to 20% or more—from 21% in Michigan to as high as 42% in Connecticut. Only two States (Utah and Hawaii) of the 27 replying reported a lower proportion than the 1971–72 average. Virtually all State chapters had markedly improved the ratio to almost double (18.7%) the 1971–72 figure—in short, very nearly to the 20% goal set by the Task Force.

An interesting note: the women's survey may have had an effect just by virtue of its being made at all. One planning director in Florida reported that after completing the 1975 survey, he took another look at a vacant senior professional position on his staff, for which he had over 400 applicants, and deliberately filled it with a woman planner, his first at a senior level.

II. Our Cultural Institutions

Do women fare well in the nation's cultural institutions? The Committee on the Arts and Humanities examined the status of women in two of the most familiar of these: libraries and museums.

LIBRARIES

Librarianship has often been called a "women's profession." Of the 123,144 people who told the U.S. Census of 1970 they were librarians, about 82% were women. But something paradoxical is happening. The men are taking over—taking over, that is, more and more of the top jobs.

The trend has been underway for perhaps 20–25 years or more. In 1930 women not only formed an even larger proportion of the profession (91%) but held many of the top jobs. In that year 27% of the libraries in the country's 74 largest academic institutions accredited by the American Association of Universities were headed by women, by 1967 it was 5%. In 1950, 50% of the deans and directors of library schools were women, in 1970 only 19%. In 1950, 80% of the State librarians and State library agency directors were women; by November 1975, only 34% were in their hands. Some libraries of the elite women's colleges, traditionally directed by women, for the first time in these institutions' history placed men in the top positions: Barnard in 1967, Smith in 1968. (Smith relented: in 1970 it restored a woman to the post.)

Although the Committee held no hearings on librarianship, it very early got in touch with the Task Force on the Status of Women of the American Library Association (ALA). The Task Force, formed in 1970, has acted as the necessary catalyst within the Association, sparking recent efforts toward more affirmative action.

The Task Force provided us with valuable data on women in the profession, including a basic 1972 study prepared by Anita R. Schiller of the University of California at San Diego. It is largely from this Schiller study and a 1975 report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on *Library Manpower*, plus talks with people in

the library field, that we have drawn the data for our brief review here.

Why has the shift to men in top positions taken place in recent years? The Bureau of Labor Statistics study puts it baldly: "Many library administrators consider it desirable to increase the number of men on the staff, especially at the professional level, in order to counter the profession's 'feminine image.' As a consequence, an effort to recruit men to the profession is underway in the nation's leading libraries and library schools . . . (and) more men than ever before are available for employment as librarians."

The BLS study also points to the important developments in librarianship which in themselves have encouraged this trend: the salary improvements of recent years; innovations in cataloging procedures, which include application of computer technology to data processing; increased specialization of library tasks so that more time can be devoted to "professional" work such as program planning and administration, and less time on routine operations. The BLS study goes on to say, "The increase in the number of men (an 80% increase between 1960 and 1970) may reflect a heightened tendency for new college graduates with backgrounds in management, computer science, audio-visual technology, law and engineering to consider careers in librarianship."

Schiller points out that the trends toward male takeovers of the top jobs "began to accelerate during the sixties, a few years after the passage of the Library Services Act. Thereafter, federal funds and matching grants from the states began to be disbursed to these agencies to strengthen public library development, and millions of dollars were added to their combined budgets. As these positions acquired greater responsibility and influence, they were increasingly assigned to men..." Schiller adds, "The apparent irony is that the wipe-out rate began to accelerate as support for libraries increased."

It is interesting to note that the prestigious Library of Congress was, as of June 1975, 49% male. Its record of 18% women in senior level positions, and 13% women in top supergrade positions (as compared with 4% in May 1972), deserves some credit—it is a rare record among Federal Government agencies.

Salary scales in libraries had long been low. There appears to be some differences of opinion whether the overwhelming presence of women in the profession caused the low salary level, or was a result of it. But today, following passage of the Library Services Act of 1956 and its later supplements, which made far better salaries possible, according to the BLS study, "women librarians, while making less than men, do relatively better than women in other professional occupations . . . and (have earnings) about 42% higher than the average for all women in the experienced civilian labor force."

Women librarians' earnings are about two-thirds as much as men's. There may be some reasons for this, aside from outright discrimination. One of these is age, with many older women librarians having completed their training in the 1930's and 1940's before a master's degree in librarianship was considered, as it is today, "a basic requirement." As a whole, fewer women librarians (39%) than men (52%) have completed 5 years of college or more.

But these differences aside, salary discrimination is still the rule for women with the same degree qualifications as men, in the same age group, and with the same experience. For example, women holding library science doctorates earn only 75% as much as men with similar degrees. Things may be changing for the younger librarians. In the 31–40 age group, women doctorates earn 84% as much as men.

In the top-paying jobs (over $15,000 a year in 1970), however, discrimination is virtually unrestrained: only 1.0% of women have such jobs, as compared to 15% of all men, according to the 1975 BLS study.

What can be done? The Task Force of the ALA is keeping on with its efforts to provide information, training opportunities, and publicity on the status of "the disadvantaged majority." The Committee hopes the ALA will strengthen its support and, working through State associations and nationally, help to correct discriminatory practices. The IWY Commission's Recommendation VI urges more women in senior positions in all such cultural institutions, as libraries. Recommendation II specifically addresses the problem raised by the Libraries Services Act: how women appear to lose out on top jobs when such institutions are expanded with Federal funding.

Archivists are in a sense related to librarians, but their profession is so distinct they have their own professional organization, the Society of American Archivists (SAA). Their own ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in mid-1974 issued its own survey as to how women fare in their special profession.

Two major differences appear at once. They are few in number compared to librarians—according to the 1970 U.S. Census there were only 2,167 women archivists compared to 100,325 women librarians. Moreover, archivists are not primarily women. The 1970 U.S. Census cites only 31% women. (The SAA's study of 147 institutions reports 47%.) But women archivists tend to share some of the same characteristics as women librarians: as a group they are older, and fewer of them have post-college training.

But, according the SAA study, "whether viewed in terms of comparable educational standards or years of service," salaries are discriminatory. Among those who hold bachelor's degrees, women archivists earn only 70% as much as men. The gap narrows for

women Ph.D.'s, but it does not close. Men also dominate in administrative positions, with Federal archival institutions showing the poorest record (only 17% women).

The women archivists asked a particularly interesting question in their survey—whether the archivists felt there was discrimination in their work place. Two-thirds of the men replying said "no"—but half the women said "yes." The younger archivists—men and women—under 40 were markedly more aware of discrimination than were the older members, mentioning first, discrimination as to promotion and, second, discrimination as to salary.

Will affirmative action plans help? Mabel E. Deutrich, who chaired the women archivists' survey, summarized in January 1975 the survey's conclusion: "Of the 147 institutions included . . . 80% indicated they had an affirmative action/equal employment program. To the administrators of these programs, it must be obvious that . . . they have not been effective."

MUSEUMS

Museums are today more valued, visited, and supported by American people than ever before. Federal, State, and municipal government support of museums is substantial and rising. More and more women have been earning degrees in art and art history, and are interested in, and applying for, museum work. Yet the overall record of museums in providing equal opportunities for women is a shabby one. The President of the Association of American Museums, Joseph V. Noble, in his 1975 inaugural address put it flatly: "Clearly museums are guilty . . . of blatant sexism."[1]

The Committee held no special hearing on museums, but assembled data on the status of women in museums from several sources. One is the basic study, *Museums USA*, prepared for the National Endowment for the Arts, by Louis Harris & Associates, and published in 1974. We also assembled information from small studies such as that reported by Susan Stitt in "The Search for Equality," (*Museum News*, September/October 1975) citing recent research by Old Sturbridge Village, and by the N.Y. State Association of Museums. Another source is an "exploratory" study, prepared at the Committee's request by Vandegriff Research, on the economic status of women in 50 museums (27 museums responding). In addition, the Committee talked to members of the College Art Association, of the American Association of Museums, and individual museum professionals.

[1] *Museum News*, Sept./Oct. 1975.

All sources agree that discrimination against women is marked and pervasive in the museum world. One distinguished woman curator told the Committee, "the male hierarchy would prefer not to have anything to do with us—some terrible attitudes exist." Discrimination takes several forms, varying with the size and type of museum. It is most serious in larger museums (those with a budget of $1 million or more) and in museums run by the Federal Government. In smaller museums (budgets under $50,000), relatively as many women (46%) as men are directors. But this proportion drops rapidly to barely more than 4% in museums which have budgets of as little as $250,000 or more.

Taking museums as a whole, 38% of all senior museum personnel are women, but the larger the museum the less chance women have to hold senior positions. Further, even those women who have achieved senior rank average little more than half the salaries of their male counterparts—according to *Museums USA* 1971–72 salary data for museums of all types.

The salary discrimination is applied from the very start. The exploratory survey, prepared by Vandegriff Research, showed that the 22 museums, large and small, responding to a query on this point, paid starting salaries to women in 1973 and 1974 some 20% lower than starting salaries for men. The average was $11,120 for women against $14,000 for men, even though more of the women hired had previous museum experience. Old Sturbridge Village studies show similar $2,000–$3,000 gaps in starting salaries. Many museums do not, however, keep starting salary records by sex. Federal museums pay better than private ones as a whole. But they have proportionately fewer women directors than private nonprofit museums (21% compared with 34%), and the lowest proportion of women (21%) in senior positions of any type of museum. The Smithsonian Institution, for example, as late as October 1974, had only 11.9% women in its upper middle and senior positions.[2]

The Committee feels strongly that Federal museums must exert leadership—rather than as at present lag behind other museums in fair employment policies for women.

The Committee is also deeply concerned that institutions receiving Federal funds (and State and local funds) have established, and persist in, such "blatantly sexist" employment practices. The Committee's Recommendation VIII, adopted by the full Commission, is a deliberate effort to insure equal opportunities for women in programs and institutions receiving Federal funds and assistance, and Recommendation VII asks for better employment record keeping by both Federal and private museums.

---

[2] *Civil Service News*, Oct. 6, 1975.

One final issue brought before the Committee is that of the widespread use of unpaid volunteers as museum staff. There are over 64,000 such volunteers, according to the *Museums USA* study, constituting the astonishing total of 57% of all museum staff. Most unpaid volunteers are understood to be women. Many of them are docents, serving as guides and informal lecturers who show collections to museum visitors, especially school groups. Views are divided as to whether these unpaid docents in effect hold down salaries of women professional employees in the museum, or prevent trained women from getting paid jobs as docents. At the same time there is also recognition that in the present period of severe staff shortages and tight budgets for all museums, finding funds to pay for services which volunteers now contribute free would be difficult indeed and might result in the sharp cutback, even elimination, of many present museum services.

III. Private Foundations

Private tax-exempt foundations are a key source of support for the arts and humanities. One estimate puts foundation grants alone at 15% of the total resources for cultural expenditures.

Exact figures are hard to come by here, since the several studies available on the subject vary considerably in the fields covered, and their findings are not comparable.

The Committee felt, however, it should make at least some effort to determine some general data, particularly as to the extent women are included on award-judging panels and on the boards of directors. It asked Vandegriff Research to conduct a questionnaire survey of some 84 private foundations.

The survey yielded the following information: out of 48 smaller foundations which have a specific interest in and make grants to the arts and humanities, there were 6 women out of 48 directors listed. Some 26%–27% of their award-judging panels were women. Adding 36 large foundations for a total of 84, their award-judging panels have an average of 16.6% women.

Regrettably, none of the foundations surveyed keep special records of the number of applications for grants received, granted, and denied by race, age, or sex of applicants. Nor is this information required in the reports that tax-exempt foundations must file with the Internal Revenue Service. The Committee urges in several of its Recommendations that such record keeping, as well as publication of the makeup of awards panels, be adopted by private award-granting foundations, as a matter of simple justice and good public relations. (See Recommendations II and VII.)

IV. Teaching the Arts and Humanities

Here and there throughout this report the Committee has already touched on the discrimination that exists against women in colleges and universities. Many women artists, whether in painting, sculpture, or music, depend on teaching for the essential earnings supplement to support their creative work. For women in the humanities, college and university teaching is, of course, their major profession, and for all but a few who may write text books, or popular or scholarly works which command wide audiences, usually their sole source of income.

The Committee felt there was that it should examine, as best its time permitted, the status of these women in "academia."

It is fairest to begin by showing the relatively inferior position of women faculty in academia as a whole. New figures released on a preliminary basis in February 1976 by the Office of Education [1] show the following: that women comprised, overall, 24% of 1975 faculty of any rank in the nation's colleges and universities. This is a small gain but one worth noting, from the level of 22.4% in 1971–72. Only 9.8% of full professors are women; and only 16.8% of all associate professors. Only below these two top ranks do women form a roughly equal proportion to men on the faculties in higher education.

In the past year (1975 as compared to 1974) the percent of women as a whole in the two top ranks has declined slightly, while gaining in the lower ranks.

Salaries for women faculty generally are consistently below those of men of the same rank—with the greatest dollar difference showing up at the university level and in the two top ranks. The overall difference is $2,538 in 4-year colleges, and some $1,600 in 2-year colleges, compared to over $4,300 in universities. In short, the lower a woman's rank, and the smaller the institution, the more likely she is to earn more nearly the salary of her male colleagues. Moreover, according to the Office of Education when salary raises

[1] *Salaries, Tenure and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 1975–76.* National Center for Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Feb. 1976.

are handed out, men—at least in 1974–75—got bigger raises than women: a 6.3% increase compared to 5.8% for women.

Women faculty on a whole also have less job security, the official data show. Only 42% have tenure, compared to 60% of the men.

One final blow: under the retirement plans widely used by colleges and universities, according to the American Association of University Professors, retired women professors get smaller monthly payments than men, even when they have paid in equal amounts over the same period of time. The rationale given is that women live longer than men. While some private pension plans in other fields have this provision, many, including those of the Federal Government, do not.

This then is the general background of inequity which faces women faculty as a whole in academia. Do the women faculty in the arts and humanities fare any better?

On arts faculties, the situation of women generally appears to be somewhat less favorable. A 1973 survey, made by the Women's Caucus of the College Art Association (CAA), of 164 art departments in accredited higher institutions, showed 20.5% women in full-time faculty positions. Only 14.8% were tenured, however—a striking difference from the 42% for college and university faculty as a whole in 1975. However, 12% of the full professors were women—that's noticeably better than 9.5% average for academia generally.

But strange facts emerge at the same time. Three-fourths of the 164 art departments surveyed have no woman full professors at all. Outside the art department of women's and religious schools, women are very rarely chosen as department heads, except in the smallest schools where some 18% of the department chairmen are women. In the largest art departments, the figure is 8%, in art history departments 5%, in studio departments 0%.

In 1975 the CAA partially updated its survey, but only one cheerful fact turned up—women in 1975 comprised 22.4% of the total faculty, up from 20.5% in 1973.

No salary data was collected in either survey. The Committee can turn for only a partial answer to the 1970 U.S. Census data, which shows that the 1969 median earnings of teachers of art (plus drama and music) are half of those of their male counterparts.

As to women *on music faculties*, the Committee on the Status of Women formed in 1972 in the College Music Society sparked several studies through which, for the first time, data began to be collected. The National Association of Schools of Music in a 1973–74 survey showed that 21.4% of total music faculties are women. Overall, some 10.6% of them are full professors.

At the same time, in the many music specialties the proportion of women varies very widely. In piano teaching, for instance, women make up 49.2% of all piano faculties, and 12% of all full professors;

in music education they make up 32% of the total faculty, and 18% of the full professors. In sharp contrast, women are rare on total faculties (all ranks), in conducting (10.2%), and in music composition (10.1%).

In an article in *High Fidelity/Musical America*, June 1975, Adrienne Fried Block makes the crucial observation: "What is significant is that most composers are dependent on college teaching for a steady source of income. But women are all but excluded from this employment." Unfortunately no information on salary and tenure are available. One hopeful note: the number of women getting Ph.D.'s in music is apparently growing—it went up from 13% in 1971–72 to 23% in 1973–74.

Do women *teaching the humanities* fare any better? Again surveys furnished to the Committee by women's "caucuses" formed in many major academic professional and learned associations provided invaluable information.

As to *women historians*, the American Historical Association, for example, appointed an ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in October 1969 to make its survey. The survey, covering 30 representative institutions for a 10-year period, found that while women received about 15% of the Ph.D.'s in history from leading graduate departments, those departments employed 98–99% men on their faculties, with women given jobs only in the lower nontenured ranks. Even in the top coeducational liberal arts colleges, women constituted only 10% of the total faculty in their history departments. The study even found "a progressive deterioration in the history departments of coeducational colleges. In 1959–60, 16% of the full professors in history were women; in 1968–69 only one woman full professor remained, and she retired the following year." Also noted was a decline in the proportion of associate professors.

The American Historical Association meeting after receipt of the study, in December 1970, expressed "its formal disapproval of discrimination against women in graduate school admissions, grants, awarding of degrees; and in faculty recruitment, salary, promotions and conditions of employment," and pledged itself to "work actively to enlarge the numbers of women in the profession." The Association funds a special position to pursue problems concerning women, and in late 1975 followed up its 1970 study to see what progress, if any, had been made. Although complete results are not yet available, partial figures suggest only the most marginal gains.

The *teaching of English and foreign languages* is one humanities field where there are larger proportions of women on total faculties than in academia generally. For facts in this field the Committee is indebted to a special women's "Commission" set up within the Modern Languages Association (MLA). Its detailed study, published

in the January 1976 issue of MLA's prestigious journal, but covering the period 1972–73, shows that women comprise a little over a third (34% in English, 35% in foreign languages) of all faculty in modern languages in universities and colleges.

But again, women are preponderantly represented in 4-year colleges (44% of total faculty), where teaching loads are among the heaviest and time for independent research and writing is scarcest.

At the universities, fewer women, even with Ph.D.'s, are full-time professors—only 7% in English, 9% in foreign languages. But counting the women at colleges as well as universities, we find 14% listed as full professors—a rather better record than academia's as a whole.

The study notes, however, that between 1969–70 and 1972–73 women in modern languages did make some gains in rank at the associate professor (or "No. 2") level, with substantial numbers of women Ph.D.'s being promoted at a rate about equal to that of men. It is at the associate professor level, the study notes, moreover, where salaries, which show a consistent and continuing differential between men and women in other ranks, tend to become equal.

The MLA study comments, by the way, after a highly detailed analysis of predictive factors on promotions, that "women are more likely to succeed in terms of rank when they are not married and do not have dependent children."

Women college and university *teachers of classical languages* (represented by the American Philological Association) also set up an active study committee and have come up with interesting results on their status in their very specialized field.

They found that the hiring of women at coeducational institutions in 1975 continued to be proportionately low, and that in such institutions only an incredibly low 9% of the women faculty have tenure. Worse still, there were (in 1974) *no* women classical languages faculty with tenure at the newly formed coeducational schools responding to the survey.

But most interesting is the 1974 finding that there was "no significant difference in salary level between the sexes" and the 1975 finding that "women (teachers of classical languages) are now competing on an equal footing with men in the present job market." The study Committee, however, states that "we do not condone the practice (if and where it exists) of hiring primarily on the basis of sex, whichever sex has the advantage."

A special problem affecting all women college and university teachers of the arts and humanities (as well as of other academic subjects) is whether they publish articles, books and reviews, or can do so without prejudice. Acceptance of papers for publication, or presentation of such papers at professional meetings, is considered

essential to promotion to higher rank, especially by universities. Several of the women's surveys reaching our Committee have examined this point.

Apparently women do not, as a group, publish as often as men (the exception is, according to one study, married women Ph.D.'s who have a higher publication rate than either single women Ph.D.'s or men Ph.D.'s). Among reasons given for the lower publication rate is that women are concentrated in 4-year colleges or lower positions where they have heavy teaching loads and are not expected to publish. There may be another factor. At least one group—the women teachers of classical languages—in 1973 asked for anonymous or blind review of their papers submitted for publication or presentation. By 1975 the proportion of women approved to present papers at the society's annual meeting tripled. The IWY Commission has, as mentioned earlier, urged wider use of "blind" reviews (and auditions) in Recommendation III.

V. Government and the Arts and Humanities

Government—Federal, State, or local—has a crucial part to play in the arts and humanities. One of the most important is that, of course, of patron—city governments funding libraries and museums, State governments funding universities, the Federal Government establishing agencies through which the arts and humanities can be encouraged and sustained. Still another role is that of adopting legislation, and tax and other policies sensitive to the needs of artists, humanists, and cultural institutions.

The Arts and Humanities Committee has explored, to the extent that time permitted, these roles of government, specifically as they affect women.

The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, set up only 10 years ago, are the principal source of Federal funding in these fields. The Committee devoted one hearing to the National Endowment for the Arts, and another to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The founding, indeed, of these Endowments was America's first concrete public commitment and assertion that the "encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter of private and local initiative, are also an appropriate matter of concern for the Federal government." Since this historic decision—it is certainly no less—the surge of public interest in and support for the arts and humanities has been reflected in growing political support for the Endowments over three administrations and in Congress, and in a marked rise in annual Federal appropriations.

Both Endowments, with increasing funds, have expanded their programs, and their impact on the arts and humanities has itself stimulated both public interest in and Federal, State, and local government support for them.

Three major questions were of concern to us: first, do the Endowments themselves, in their governing councils and award-making bodies, as well as in their staff, and in the arts and humanities councils now set up with Endowment support in every State, adequately represent the role of women? Second, do their grant

awards, both to individuals and cultural institutions, benefit women on an equitable basis? Third, do the Endowments make an effort to determine, and where needed, take steps to improve, the status of women in their fields?

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS (NEA)

The National Endowment for the Arts devotes the major share of its resources to support of symphonies, dance and theater companies, and museums, as well as grants to individual artists and—one of its primary goals—to making the arts more available to more people. In answering the Committee's three questions, NEA reported that its policy-making body, the National Council on the Arts, has a 10-year average of 23% women members and noted that the Council itself, of course, is headed by Nancy Hanks, who chairs the Endowment. As of December 1975, there were 6 women on its 26 member Council. On the State Arts Councils, whose members are appointed by governors, men and women are virtually equally represented.

The Endowment's 14 specialized advisory panels, which judge individuals and institutions for awards, vary widely in their proportion of women members, currently having as few as 13% women on its literature panel, 12% on its theater panel to 61% on the dance panel; for all the 14 panels the average is 25% women. The Endowment in a note submitted later to the Committee explains the present makeup of its judging panels as follows:

> "Where variation from one panel to another occurs, the primary factor is lack of availability in a particular field. For example, in the museum program there are few women in leadership roles; in the theater program staff have found that actresses are rarely available and there are few women in top management positions; the literature program has, in fact, a higher percentage of women in the professional writing field on its panel than apply for grants in that field . . . It is particularly difficult finding top qualified women who have the time available to serve.
>
> "The Endowment does not feel that specific remedies are necessary to ensure increased representation of women on its panels, since consciousness of the need and continued efforts to seek out the qualified will result in improved proportions as availability of women in the less represented areas increases."

The Committee was not wholly satisfied with this reply, noting, for example, that in the case of the literature panel, roughly 30% of all authors (1970 U.S. Census) are women, and that a large number of very distinguished women are in this field, both in the universities and elsewhere.

Testimony from some women artists had raised the question of whether women had received a fair share of NEA's grants to artists. At the hearing, NEA representatives said that while they do not keep a complete record of all grant applications, they had gathered for the hearing the following data for a few of their grant programs:

Fellowships/grants	*Percent of applications from women*	*Percent of grants to women*
Artists	35	23
Print makers	43	48
Art critics	49	59
Craftsmen	43	45
Photographers	20	16
Literature	26	27
All fellowships	31	33

The NEA told the Committee that the number of individual grants now equals about 650 (as compared to 30 in 1965) and the total number of applications is increasing. The Committee suggested that wider publicity in women's publications, particularly women's art journals and other publications, about available NEA grants might bring in more applications from women and has arranged to have a comprehensive list of such journals prepared for NEA.

As to women on staff, NEA clearly has one of the better records among government agencies in employment of women (except for black women) in middle and upper middle level jobs, although the Endowment itself feels there is room for improvement at these levels. At the time of the hearing, November 6, 1975, there was no black woman in such a position; there is now one.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES (NEH)

A similar hearing was held with the NEH, and many of the same questions were posed. The Committee was impressed with the care and attention with which this agency had reviewed its programs for equitable participation of women in its grants and other benefits, and their marked spirit of cooperation with the Committee and its objectives.

The Endowment acknowledged at the outset that, working in the humanities, which are organized chiefly within the structure of higher education where women make up 24% of all faculty, it was confronted with "some serious obstacles to making any substantial impact on women as groups" and that its funds "may in fact serve, but not change, a system with a long history of inequality for women."

Over the past 10 years NEH's National Council on the Humanities, its top policy-making body appointed by the President, has consisted of 20–25% women. On its several award-judging panels, there are about 13% women,[1] a figure reflecting—although excessively in the view of the Committee—the relatively low representation of women in college and university teaching. Membership on some panels, however, shows a higher proportion of women, e.g., youth grants, 50%; junior college fellowships, 22% to 27%.

The Endowment cited to the Committee some examples of its grants to women and women's study projects in recent years. One of the largest ($5.2 million)—indeed, the largest single grant ever made by the Endowment—was for production of "The Adams Chronicles," the 13-part public TV show conceived and produced by a woman (Virginia Kessell). Another large grant is enabling the University of Minnesota to complete a guide to manuscript and archival sources on the history of women in the United States.

In general, a smaller number of women than men apply for NEH grants, in what the Endowment believes is another reflection of the low proportions of women in academia. While the Endowment reported that there is no special effort to encourage women applicants, there has been some gradual rise in the proportion of applications from women. In the last 4 years women applicants for the prestigious Senior Fellowships (which require advanced degrees) has gone up from 14.7% women to 19.8%.

Noting that grants are awarded on merit alone, the Endowment said that "women fare relatively well" in proportion of grants they receive compared to the number who apply. Indeed the relative number of women receiving the Senior Fellowships has paralleled or exceeded the proportion of women applicants. For example in 1974–75, 19.8% of all Senior Fellowship applicants were women, and 22.6% of all the grants were awarded to women.

An interesting point was raised at our hearing as to the dollar value of the Senior Fellowships. The Endowment reported that its policy had been to determine the dollar value of the grant on the basis of the previous year's salary of the recipient (up to a maximum of $20,000 a year). Committee members questioned this policy; since women in academia traditionally earn less than men, a grant awarded on the basis of their lower earnings, it was felt, was per-

[1] The Board of Foreign Scholarships which handles for the Department of State the international education (the so-called "Fulbright") exchange fellowships has only 20% women on its senior award panels. The Committee feels even this proportion is too low and unrepresentative of women now in academic life. It should be noted that, in these "Fulbright" international exchange grants no distinction is made as to dollar amounts awarded to men or women scholars.

Comparison of Women's Representation on Government Grant-Awarding Panels

	Total members	*Number of women*	*Percent of women*
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS (FY–1974)			
All panels	297	67	23
Selected art panels (comparable to art student panels, Board of Foreign Scholarships)[1]	184	44	24
National Council for the Arts	[2]26	[3]6	23
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES (FY–1974)			
All panels	425	64	15
Fellowships	252	30	12
Research	29	4	14
Youth grants	23	7	30
National Council for the Humanities	26	4	15
BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS (1976–77) (U.S. Department of State)			
Scholars	202	40	20
Students	99	29	29
Art students only	48	14	29

[1] Architecture, music, visual arts, dance.
[2] 27, including the chairman, Nancy Hanks.
[3] 7, including the chairman.

petuating this traditional inequity. The Endowment representatives agreed on the spot on the need to equalize its Senior Fellowships in the future, and will present the question to its policy-making board, the National Council on the Humanities, at its May 1976 meeting.

As with the National Endowment for the Arts, the NEH has achieved a high standard in its employment of women in policy-making positions. Of its four top operating divisions, the director of one is a woman, and of the four deputies of these divisions, one is a woman. Of the Endowment's 14 major programs, 6 (43%) are headed by women.

A major concern of the Committee in regard to both the Endowments is that, though they are major sources of Federal funding of cultural institutions—from ballet companies and symphony orchestras to museums and libraries—they do not have, at this time, authority to exact from these institutions compliance with equal employment opportunity requirements for women. Thus, Federal funds can be (and are) channeled to symphony orchestras which discriminate against women instrumentalists, or to museums in which men

hold the majority of all senior policy-making positions. The universities are moving—although we have just seen how slowly—into compliance and adoption of affirmative action plans because they must do so as a condition for direct Federal funding. Both Endowments, before they can require compliance of grantee institutions, are now awaiting the completion of the so-called Equal Employment Opportunity "guidelines" which, since 1972, have been worked on by HEW, the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The IWY Commission addressed itself to this problem in Recommendation VIII, asking the President to act on the issue through an Executive order.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND THE ARTS

Testimony before the Committee by both performing and creative artists pointed out several major areas where Federal—and sometimes State and local—legislative and administrative policies work a hardship on all artists, men and women. Any such hardships are felt, of course, especially by women artists because of their lower earnings generally and the special discriminations they experience in other ways.

Particularly singled out were certain income tax provisions said to be notably "insensitive" to the needs of artists. One of these is IRS reluctance to allow for reasonable deductions for the maintenance at home of a studio—or in the case of a performing artist, of office space—regardless of other sources of income. In the same vein, artists told the Committee of the need for recognition of artists' legitimate business expenses, such as shipping, handling, and insurance costs of materials sent for exhibition (often a costly affair), and costs—for performing artists—of coaching, agents' fees, and publicity. The Committee was shown a 1970 study prepared for Actors' Equity by Temple University which reported that over half (58%) of all actors had their income taxes subjected to audit—a rate far exceeding that of the general public.

Another income tax inequity reported to the Committee was the extremely low valuation placed upon a work donated by the artist to a museum, for example. If the artist gives the work directly, he or she may for income tax purposes deduct, as "contribution," only the cost of the materials of the work—in the case of a painting perhaps less than $25. If, however, the artist had sold the painting to a collector, the collector may, in presenting the painting to a museum, deduct its current market value—say $500, $5,000 and on up.

A related and far more serious inequity, the Committee learned, is imposed when an artist dies. All his or her unsold works are then

assessed at current market value, and the heirs in consequence have in some instances to pay exorbitant estate taxes. The Committee was told of the case of the family of an artist whose works remained largely unsold during his lifetime but became extremely valuable upon his death. The impoverished family faced inheritance taxes they could not possibly pay.

Another curious—and inequitable—income tax matter is the distinction made between tax rulings affecting inventors and artists. An inventor who sells his or her invention pays a tax only upon the capital gains accruing from the sale; an artist—surely an inventor in another medium?—must count the full proceeds from the sale of a work of art as ordinary income and thus pay a far higher tax on it.

The Committee, finding these income tax provisions to work specific hardship on artists, passed a resolution [1] recommending that the President instruct the Internal Revenue Service and the Congress, now in the process of making basic income tax reforms, to adjust these inequities and to "show a long-absent sensitivity to the particular needs and problems of artists."

Another piece of Federal legislation of particular importance to performing artists is the copyright law, now also undergoing revision by Congress for the first time since it was adopted in 1909. The Committee heard testimony that the present unrevised law gives copyright protection only to the composer and lyricist of a recorded work of music. The conductor, the instrumentalists and performing artists of the recorded work receive no copyright protection or royalties. Performing artists whose readings are taped or recorded—as in a radio drama—similarly receive no copyright protection when their work is broadcast.

The Committee also learned that broadcasters derive juicy benefits from the antiquated copyright laws. Recorded music accounts for 75% of all radio programming in commercially available time. The music attracts radio audiences, on the basis of which stations earn substantial profits. While broadcasters must pay the composers and lyricists, they pay nothing for the creative efforts of the musicians, artists, and recording groups who produce this basic program material. The Committee was informed that almost every other Western nation requires payment of performance royalties for all sound recordings.

Further, under present copyright law authors have no protection against unauthorized duplication of their works by today's technologically advanced fast-copying devices—devices not even conceived when the copyright law was drawn up in 1909.

---

[1] The IWY Commission as a whole could not adopt this resolution since it does not apply specifically to women. See p. 49.

The Committee recommended [3] that the President instruct the Congress to take these issues into account in its current consideration of reforms of the old law.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

The final, very broad and urgent question considered by the Committee is the need for continued and enhanced Federal, State, and local support of the arts. Overwhelming testimony exists that such government support of the arts is imperative to sustain the nation's major cultural institutions—from museums to ballet companies, to theaters and symphonies, to cultural agencies which bring the arts to schools and small communities.

Most arts organizations are not and cannot be self-supporting. Only 50% of their revenues come from ticket sales, admissions, and other earned income. Another 30% comes from public contributions. It is true that the amount of private financial support has been rising markedly, as the American people become more and more aware of and concerned with the contribution of the arts to the quality of life. A study made in the fall of 1975 by the National Committee for Cultural Resources shows that over the 4-year period between 1971–72 and 1974–75, private giving by individuals, corporations, and foundations rose by 21%, to $38.9 million.

Yet a sizable gap remains—some 20% of total needs. City, county, State, and Federal aid is obviously required to make up the balance. Government support is clearly established public policy today. According to a survey by Louis Harris & Associates for the National Research Center of the Arts, the American public even said they would be "willing to pay increased taxes if the money were to go to support of the arts and culture." This public attitude has now been reflected at the political level. The nation's mayors at their 1974 annual conference and the nation's governors at their 1975 conference passed resolutions asserting the need to help support the arts and make them available to all. City and county aid has gone up over 60% in the last 5 years, State aid 50%. But with inflation, with cities and States in financial crises, and as other factors increase the costs of basic services, in many cases there has been a cutback of staff, museum and library admission hours, and art, music, and dance programs for young people in our schools, as well as for the general public. The future outlook is gloomy.

[3] Again, the full Commission could not adopt this resolution because it did not apply predominantly to women. See p. 49.

At the national level, Federal aid, specifically through the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, because of their growing popular and political support, has progressively increased.

For example, from an initial annual budget of only $2.5 million in 1965 for each Endowment, the 1975 budget for each had risen to nearly $75 million. But these amounts remain far below those actually authorized by Congress. The actual authorization by Congress in fiscal 1975 for each Endowment was $126 million.

But the Committee learned that the U.S. lags far behind other Western nations in its proportion of such funding. For the arts alone, Canada spends $1.50 per person; Western Germany, $2.50 per person; the United States, 35 cents. Calling this amount only a "token" of support, some Committee members favored raising the annual authorized funding of the Arts Endowment to $200 million—about $1 per person.

The Committee, therefore, in a major recommendation[4] has strongly urged maximum funding of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities at the Federal level. At the State and local level, it urged that governors and mayors, in accordance with their already adopted resolutions, take positive action to increase support of the arts and art institutions, and that State and local women's groups not only increase their own support of community art and cultural organizations, but also monitor the adequate representation of women in these institutions.

The Committee has also recommended that governors and mayors, in conformance with their own nationally adopted resolutions, act to require a percentage of the total cost of every State/municipal construction budget to be set aside for purchase or commission of works of art by American artists for public buildings.

Further, the Committee has found that many States and municipalities require admission taxes to many cultural institutions which receive some form of government support—in effect "robbing Peter to pay Paul." The Committee urges that such taxes be dropped. One example shows the paradox of such taxes: the Guthrie Theatre received in 1974 approximately $150,000 from the Federal Government through the National Endowment for the Arts plus another $25,000 from the Minnesota State Arts Council. Yet the theater's home city of Minneapolis and the State of Minnesota required it to pay over $104,000 in entertainment and sales taxes. The theater's public support funds were thus shriveled to less than $74,000.

In a related issue, [illegible] ne that can also be resolved only at the State and local level, the Committee also has recommended that artists not be required to pay "entry" fees—which are often substan-

[4] Again, the full Commission could not adopt the resolution because it did not apply predominantly to women. See p. 48.

tial—for entering their works in an exhibit, if the exhibit is in a cultural institution receiving local, State, or Federal support. In the view of those creative artists appearing before the Committee such entrance fees are, in effect, a means of forcing artists, already at a financial disadvantage, to subsidize the arts.

This recommendation, as with several others of the Arts and Humanities Committee, could not be adopted by the full IWY Commission, which, under its ruling, is confined to consider issues predominantly affecting women. The Committee, however, felt so strongly about the need for additional financial support and for changes in government policies affecting the arts and humanities, that it wished to go on record as itself making recommendations on these important issues.

Whether adopted by the full IWY Commission or the Committee only, recommendations alone, of course, are not enough.

At the very least they will, it is hoped, point out not only to the Federal Government, and State and local governments, but to cultural institutions and to private agencies involved in the arts and humanities, the major issues, the serious concerns and inequities facing creative women, and provoke and guide necessary legislative and policy changes.

But most of all, this Committee hopes that this report and its recommendations will stimulate among all groups and individuals concerned with the arts and humanities a new sense of making common cause toward their support—but support that demands equitable treatment of women who, like their male colleagues, by their art, their music, their work in museums, colleges and libraries, their writings, their dance and theater, are enriching the quality of our communities and our lives.

MEMBERS OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES COMMITTEE

Rita Z. Johnston,[1] Chair
U.S. Delegate, Inter-American
Commission of Women
Bethesda, Maryland

MURIEL BERMAN
President and Chairman of the Board, Hess's Inc.,
Member, Pennsylvania Council on the Arts
Allentown, Pennsylvania

KATHRYN F. CLARENBACH
Associate Professor, Political Science
Chairperson, Wisconsin Commission on the Status of Women
University of Wisconsin Extension
Madison, Wisconsin

RICHARD CORNUELLE [1]
Author
New York, New York

JOAN KAPLAN DAVIDSON
Chairperson, New York State Council on the Arts
New York, New York

RUTH FERNANDEZ
Senator At Large, Ponce, Puerto Rico
Chairperson, Committee on Arts and Culture, Puerto Rican Senate
Concert Singer
San Juan, Puerto Rico

JACK GOLODNER
Executive Secretary, Council of AFL–CIO Union for Professional Employees
Attorney,
Vice President, Board of Trustees, Ford's Theater
Washington, D.C.

LILLIAN HELLMAN
Playwright
New York, New York

LENORE HERSHEY [1]
Editor in Chief
Ladies' Home Journal
New York, New York

ALICE HEYMAN
Consultant
New York, New York

KATHARINE HEPBURN [1]
Actress
New York, New York

MARGARET MAHONEY
Vice President
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Princeton, New Jersey

[1] Commission member.

TEIXEIRA NASH
Artist
Washington, D.C.

GILDA GJURICH [2]
President, Los Amigos Construction Company
Santa Fe Springs, California

Staff Director: BERNICE BAER
Consultant: JEAN JOYCE

[2] Commission member.

Appendix 2

LIST OF GUEST PANELISTS AT HEARINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

ANTONIA BRICO, conductor

JOYCE BARTHELSON, composer

JUNE WAYNE, lithographer and multi-media artist

LILA KATZEN, sculptor

DIANE BURKO, painter

DR. MARY GARRARD, associate professor, Art History, American University

BARBARA ROBINSON, motion picture script supervisor; International representative of the International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees

GRETCHEN WYLER, singer-dancer, actress; off-Broadway producer

JOAN SEE, TV actress and TV spokeswoman; co-chair of Women's Performing Arts Coalition, Screen Actors' Guild; member, American Federation of TV and Radio Artists

MICKI GRANT, actress-singer, playwright-composer ("Don't Bother Me—I Can't Cope") and member national and New York local board of American Federation of TV and Radio Artists

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)
LIVINGSTON BIDDLE, Congressional Liaison

National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)
ROBERT KINGSTON, Deputy Chairman

Guest Consultants

LINDA HEDDLE, art editor, *Arts in Society*, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

EMILY TAYLOR, Director, Office of Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

BERNICE SANDLER, Project Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

M. NANCY POPE, member, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Appendix 3

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES
of
The Committee on the Arts and Humanities
National Commission on the Observance of IWY

A. *Recommendations Adopted by the National Commission*

I. *On Appointment of Women to Managerial, Administrative, and Policymaking Posts in Cultural Institutions*

In view of the repeated finding of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities that women are not represented equitably in managerial, administrative, and policymaking posts in cultural institutions, the Committee on the Arts and Humanities proposes that:

> The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommend, as appropriate, State Governors, State Commissions on the Status of Women, local chief executives and local women's groups take action to insure more equitable women's representation in managerial, administrative, and policymaking posts in local cultural institutions; further, that local women's groups serve as monitors and, as necessary, sponsors of equitable appointment of women to such posts in their local cultural institutions.
>
> (Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

II. *On Assuring More Equitable Representation of Women on Grant-Awarding Panels in Public and Private Agencies*

The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommends that the President:

1. Direct all Federal grant-making agencies:
   a. To require that all their boards, committees and advisory panels which make awards be more equitably balanced in proportion of women members;
   b. To seek by all appropriate means to stimulate applications from more women candidates, especially minority women candidates;[1]
   c. To review carefully their grants and other awards to assure that women are not given smaller grants or

[1] The term "minority" is understood to include Blacks, American Indians, Oriental Americans, and persons of Hispanic origin.

awards as a result of discriminatory patterns of pay in academic and other home institutions;

d. To publish annually names of persons on award panels.

2. Direct the Office of Management and Budget to make full use of its authority to require government-supported departments and agencies that award grants/fellowships to seek out qualified women and minorities for positions on review panels where necessary to achieve an equitable balance between men and women.

The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year also urges that all grant-making private tax-exempt institutions, as a matter of simple justice, act promptly:

a. To make their grant-awarding panels more equitably balanced in proportion of women members;
b. To stimulate more grant applications from more women;
c. To assure non-discrimination in size of awards for men and women;
d. To publish annually names of persons on award panels.

(Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

III. *On Blind Judging of Candidates for Awards/Fellowships/Exhibitions/Employment*

1. The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommends to all judging agencies in the field of music that blind auditions be held for all musician candidates, including singers, in appraising the merit of such candidates for employment/awards/fellowships;

2. The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year similarly recommends to all judging agencies or review boards in the humanities and arts that they conduct blind reviews of all articles/papers presented for review for publication/delivery and similar blind review of all grant and exhibition entry application forms and supporting documents submitted for review for awards/fellowships/exhibition.

At the same time, the Committee commends those arts and humanities agencies and cultural institutions such as the American Bach Foundation and Johann Sebastian Bach International Competitions, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, the National Symphony Orchestra, and the American Philological Association, which have already initiated the above practices of blind auditions or review.

(Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

IV. *On Remedying the Under-representation of Women in Public Radio and TV Broadcasting*

In view of the findings of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities that the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting reported in a formal study to the Board of Directors of the Corporation of Public Broadcasting (CPB), October 8, 1975, overwhelming evidence of "pervasive under-representation" of women in public broadcasting both in employment and program content, and that the CPB Board in November 1975 unanimously resolved to review and act upon the Task Force's remedial proposals, the Arts and Humanities Committee recommended to the Commission that:

> The National Commission on the Observance of IWY commends the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's resolve to remedy the "pervasive under-representation of women," both in employment and in program content in public radio and TV, and at the same time recommends to the President that he recommend to Office of Management and Budget and to the Congress that a statement be submitted by CPB on remedial steps actually taken and improvements actually achieved when CPB makes its requests for appropriations for the next and all subsequent fiscal years. Further, the Commission recommends that CPB, in 1980, five years hence, do a follow-up study that will demonstrate to the public the improvements achieved.
>
> (Adopted by the National Commission, December 5, 1975.)

V. *On Remedying the Inequitable Use of Women in Prime-Time TV Roles and TV Commercials*

In view of the finding of the Arts and Humanities Committee that in commercial TV broadcasting there is a marked under-representation of women in prime-time roles and in commercials, the Committee proposes that:

> The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year urge that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) make full use of its authority under Section 707 of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act to identify and attack patterns and practices of discrimination among major employers in commercial TV broadcasting and commercial TV industry clients and their advertising sponsors.
>
> (Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

NOTE.

The EEOC under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has the authority not only to investigate individual complaints but also to challenge on its own initiative broad institutional practices of discrimination. Section 707 of Title VII, which gives EEOC the latter authority, has been used relatively infrequently. The United States Commission on Civil Rights has urged the EEOC to institute more litigation under Section 707 because such a strategy would permit the agency to focus on certain industries.[2] The precedent of the EEOC's case against A.T.&T. (a regulatee of the Federal Communications Commission) should, however, be applied to the communications industry. As of January 1976, the EEOC has filed only three lawsuits against broadcast stations.[3] This record should be changed.

VI. *On Grants-in-Aid to Cultural Institutions*

The Arts and Humanities Committee proposes the following recommendation for adoption by the Commission:

> The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommends that all government agencies considering grants-in-aid to cultural institutions require that the institution requesting an award a) make assessments of the impact of such grants on the status of women in the institutions and b) as necessary include suitable provisions for assuring equal employment opportunities and affirmative action for women so that the grant will in no way diminish the relative position of women in the institution.
>
> (Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

VII. *On Equal Opportunity for Women Museum Professionals*

The Arts and Humanities Committee submits the following recommendations for consideration:

> The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommends that:

1. The American Association of Museums encourage its member institutions to keep records, by sex, of job applicants, of starting salaries and of newly appointed paid professional staff and to write such standards for record keeping into its accreditation requirements.

[2] *The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—1974*, vol. V—To Eliminate Employment Discrimination. A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, July 1975, p. 543.

[3] *EEOC* v. *New York Times Co.* (WREC–TV) 13 FEP Cases 813 (6th Cir.) decided Oct. 4, 1976. *EEOC* v. *Storz Bdcstg. Co.* (*WQAM-radio*) S.D. Fla. CA 75–1853 Civ., filed Sept. 8, 1975. *EEOC* v. *American Public Life Bdcstg. Co.* (*WAPT–TV*) S.D. Miss. CA J–75–199 (R), filed Dec. 26, 1975.

2. The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the National Museum Act Grants Administration (NMA) require personnel records broken down by sex from museums requesting grants for professional staff development and/or training and a statement of their plans for including women (and minorities) in their programs.

3. All museums follow the lead of the National Museum Act Grants Administration in keeping records of grants applied for, awarded, or denied, by sex of the principal investigator or project director.

(Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

VIII. *On Issuing an Executive Order To Ensure Equal Opportunity for Women in any Program or Activity Receiving Federal Funds or Assistance*

The Committee on the Arts and Humanities endorses the current recommendation of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights designed to ensure equal opportunity for women in any program or activity receiving Federal funds or assistance. The Committee urges the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year to recommend to the President adoption of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' recommendation as follows:

> "The President should issue an Executive Order which states that no person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. The President should direct that each federal department and agency which is empowered to extend federal financial assistance to any program or activity (1) shall be responsible for enforcing that prohibition simultaneously with its enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and (2) shall issue, within 180 days, regulations approved by the President implementing the Executive Order."[4]

(Adopted by the National Commission, January 16, 1976.)

NOTE.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in federally assisted programs. Federal assistance covered by Title VI includes grants

[4] *The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—1974*," vol. VI, p. 804.

and loans; donations of equipment and property; detail of Federal personnel; sale, lease of, or permission to use Federal property for nominal consideration; and any other arrangement by which Federal benefits are provided. Title VI does not ban sex discrimination[8] and no statute or Executive order provides the same broad prohibition of sex discrimination as Title VI provides against discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

The Congress has, however, in recent years included prohibitions of sex discrimination both under new Federal programs and by amendment to existing programs. While these laws cover a wide spectrum of Federal programs, including, for example, elementary, secondary, and higher education, water pollution, public works development, law enforcement assistance, disaster assistance, and manpower training, not all Federal assistance programs are covered. For example, grants made by the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are not covered by Title VI nor by any other laws. The Committee on the Arts and Humanities believes that this omission should be corrected and agrees with the Civil Rights Commission that the best way is through issuance of an Executive order.

B. *Recommendations Adopted by the Committee on the Arts and Humanities*

The two following recommendations for government action that would increase support of the arts and humanities and remove legal or administrative inequities affecting women and men in these fields have been adopted by the Committee on the Arts and Humanities, but could not be presented to nor adopted by the full National Commission.

The National Commission had instructed all its Committees that "recommendations to the IWY Commission must be closely related to women. . . . Recommendations which might urge broad reforms not specifically related to women would be more appropriate from other Commissions than one on the status of women."

The Committee on the Arts and Humanities, however, felt strongly enough on both the following recommendations to include them here in its own report.

---

[8] The Civil Rights Act of 1964 bans discrimination on the grounds of race, color, and national origin in a number of areas. For example, Title II applies to places of public accommodation; Title III covers public facilities; and Title VII prohibits employment discrimination. Sex discrimination, however, is prohibited only under Title IV and Title VII.

I. *On Increasing Federal, State, and Local Support for the Arts and Humanities*

In view of Committee findings that nearly 300,000 women work in the arts and humanities, and that there is evidence of their under-employment and unemployment due in part to the widespread economic distress of many national, State, and local cultural institutions, and finding, further, that a large proportion of each dollar allocated to the arts and humanities can generate not only direct employment, but additional private expenditures, and employment opportunities,

The Committee on the Arts and Humanities submits for the consideration of the Commission the following recommendations:

1. The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year strongly urges that the President recommend to Congress maximum funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, in accordance with authorizing legislation approved by the Administration in 1975;

2. The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommends that:

a. the Governors in each State, in active pursuance of their Resolution on Arts and Culture, passed at the National Governors' Conference of June 11, 1975, initiate positive action to increase support to the States' major cultural activities and stimulate public support of the arts through State arts festivals and other means; and that the Commission further endorse as a goal that each State's support should equal, or work toward, at least ten percent of the total operating costs of the State's cultural institutions;

3. That the Mayors, in active pursuance of their Resolution on "the quality of life in our cities" at the Forty-second Annual Conference of Mayors in 1974, take positive action to recognize and sustain the arts as an essential service available to all citizens, in particular that they establish a public agency specifically concerned with the arts, as proposed in their Resolution, and that they take immediate positive action to make greater use of CETA funds to employ artists through non-profit cultural institutions;

4. Further, that both the Governors and Mayors, in pursuance of their own several Resolutions, draw up immediately the necessary legislation or policy directives requiring that a percentage of the total cost of every State/municipal construction budget be set aside for purchase or commission of American works of art for public buildings;

5. Further, that both Governors and Mayors eliminate taxes on admissions to performances/exhibitions in those cultural institutions which receive municipal/State/Federal funding;

6. That cultural institutions that receive municipal/State/Federal funds to conduct exhibitions eliminate the exaction of entry fees from artists who wish to participate in those exhibitions;

7. That State and local women's groups and other civic organizations increase not only their financial support of community arts institutions, but strongly encourage and support State and municipal compliance with the above recommendations and, as necessary, monitor adequate representation of women in such institutions and State and local arts activities.

(Adopted by the Committee on the Arts and Humanities, January 7, 1976.)

II. *On Removing Legislative and Administrative Inequities Working Especial Hardship on Women in the Arts and Humanities*

In view of the Committee's findings that many women in the arts and humanities experience marked discrimination in both academic and private pursuit of their work, and receive substantially lower annual earnings, and that any inequitable legislation or administrative policies affecting women in these fields thus imposes particularly serious hardship,

The Committee on the Arts and Humanities therefore urges that:

The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year recommend that the President:

1. Instruct the Internal Revenue Service and the Congress to assure that all income tax reforms and revisions will consider and show a long-absent sensitivity to the particular problems and needs of professional creative artists; for example, the needs for: a) reasonable deductions for the maintenance, at home, of a studio or performing artist's office; b) appropriate recognition of (and an end to excessive auditing of) legitimate business expenses of professional creative workers and performing artists (e.g., expenses such as publicity, agent's fees, coaching; or shipping and handling costs of exhibit and manuscript materials); c) assessment of the value of a work donated by an artist, not at its materials cost only, as at present, but at its true market value, as is now permitted to an art collector; d) amendment of present tax laws to permit creative artists to pay only a capital gains tax on the proceeds from the sale of their creations, just as inventors are now permitted to do

upon sale of their creations; e) establishment of an inquiry to examine inequities imposed on artists by present estate tax laws, with a view to making administrative and legal reforms.

2. Advise the Congress, in its current consideration of general reforms in 1909 copyright law, to provide protection to all creative workers and performing artists, and especially to recognize in the field of music the rights to copyright protection not only of the composer and arranger as at present, but of the conductor, instrumentalists and other performing artists recorded; and further, especially to recognize the writer's need for copyright protection against unauthorized duplication by today's technologically advanced quick-copying devices.

(Adopted by the Committee on the Arts and Humanities, January 7, 1976.)

Appendix 4

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

The Arts

—*Sex Differentials in Art Exhibition Reviews.* A Statistical Study. Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc., Los Angeles, California.

—*Survey on the Status of Women in 164 Art Departments in Accredited Institutions of Higher Education*, January 1973 (with update August 1975), Women's Caucus for Art of the College Art Association.

—*Survey of Ph.D. Programs in Art History*, College Art Association, Committee on Graduate Education in Art History, 1975.

—*Visual Dialog*, Women in the Visual Arts, Winter Issue 1975–76, Los Altos, California.

—*Woman and the Arts:* Arts in Society, University of Wisconsin, 1974.

—*The Women Artists' Movement* by Cindy Nemser, *Art Education*, November 1975.

—*National Report on the Arts*, the National Committee for Cultural Resources, Fall 1975, New York.

—*Americans and the Arts.* Highlights from a Survey of Public Opinion. Associated Council of the Arts (ACA), 1974. New York.

—*National Survey on Women in the Arts and Humanities*, 1976. Vandegriff Research, Bethesda, Maryland.

Architecture

The American Institute of Architects, Washington, D.C.:

1. *Status of Women in the Architectural Profession*, Task Force on Women in Architecture, February 1975.
2. *Women in Architecture:* A Special Report, AIA Newsletter, January 1976.
3. *Affirmative Action Plan*, December 1975.

Planning (City & Urban)

American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO), Chicago, Illinois:

1. *Women in Planning: A Report on Their Status in Public Planning Agencies.* Report 273, October 1971.
2. *Women and Blacks in Planning:* 1972. Planning Advisory Service Memo No. M–10.
3. *Survey of Women in Planning:* Report on responses received before October 1, 1975. AIP/ASPO Joint Committee on Women's Rights.

Stage, Screen, Radio–TV

Screen Actor's Guild, Los Angeles:

1. How Women and Minorities Fare on Prime-Time Shows, *Screen Actor*, Fall, 1974.
2. Women in Commercials: Fewer Jobs, Lower Pay, *Screen Actor*, Fall 1974.

—*Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting*, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, November 1975.

—*Action for Women in Theatre*, Report Committee, Action for Women in Theatre, Gloria Albee, Winter 1976, New York.

—*Women's News*, AFTRA National Women's Committee, American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, Los Angeles, January 1976.

Music

—*Women in American Symphony Orchestras*, American Symphony Orchestra League, February 1976, Vienna, Virginia.

—*The Woman Musician on Campus:* Hiring and Promotion Patterns, by Adrienne Fried Block. *High Fidelity/Musical America*, June 1975.

—*Analysis of Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, US and Canada*, Craig Short, editor. College Music Society, January 1976. (unpublished manuscript)

Museums

—*Museums, USA.* National Endowment for the Arts, 1974.

—*Museum News.* American Association of Museums, September/October 1975.

Libraries

—*Survey of College and University Libraries*, December 1975. National Center for Education Statistics. HEW.

—*Women in a Women's Profession: Strategies.* Proceedings of the Pre-conference on the Status of Women in Librarianship, American Library Association (ALA), Chicago.

—*Women in Libraries:* Newsletter of ALA/SRRT Task Force on Women, September 1975 et seq.

—*Women in Librarianship:* a bibliography 1920–1975. American Library Association, Chicago.

—*Women in Librarianship*, by Anita R. Schiller. Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 4, 1974, Academic Press, Inc.

—*Library Services and Construction Act*, as amended. Office of Education, HEW. Washington, D.C., March 1975.

—*Library Manpower:* A Study of Demand and Supply. Bulletin No. 1859, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1975.

Archives

—*Report on the Status of Women in the Archival Profession*, 1974. The Society of American Archivists, Philadelphia, Pa.

—Women in Archives: A Summary Report, by Mabel Deutrich, *The American Archivist*, January 1975.

Teaching the Humanities

Languages

—*Women in Modern Language Departments*, 1972–1973. A Report by the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession. Study III. PMLA. Publications of the Modern Language Association, Vol. 91.1. January 1976.

—*Report (1975) on the Committee on the Status of Women and Minority Groups.* Proceedings of the American Philological Association. (For earlier reports of 1973, 1974, see also Proceedings of the Philological Association, Vol. 104.1 and Vol. 105.1 respectively.)

—*LSA/CAL Manpower Study: Preliminary Report on Women and Minorities.* Linguistic Society of America, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1973. Arlington, Virginia.

Anthropology

—*Report on the Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology.* Anthropology Newsletter, Vol. 16, No. 4, April 1975. American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

History

—*Report of the Committee on the Status of Women*, November, 1970 (updated data, 1975). American Historical Association, Washington, D.C.

General

—*Civil Service News*, October 6, 1975. Women Employed in Full-time White Collar Jobs in the Federal Government. U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

—*Data Sheet on Salaries and Tenure of Full-time Instructional Faculty:* National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Education, January 27, 1976. (Preliminary)

—*Statement to the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Post-secondary Education.* June 24, 1975. American Association of University Professors.

—*Status of Women Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education Institutions.* 1971–72. National Education Association Research Memo, April 1973.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 90 cents

Stock No. 040-000-00368-1

There is a minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE :1977--226-985/6106